



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/371,687	08/10/1999	ERIN DRAKELEY O'BRIEN	08575/048001	9542
26161 7590 02/06/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER MILEF, ELDA G	
			ART UNIT 3692	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/371,687	Applicant(s) O'BRIEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Elda Milef	Art Unit 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 55-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 55-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3692

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 55-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification, as originally filed does not provide support for the invention as is now claimed, i.e., overlay application. This term is not defined in the specification. The specification describes a front login page rather than an overlay application. There is not sufficient support in the specification as to how the login screen is presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

In view of the §112 rejection, for examination purposes, the Examiner is interpreting "overlay application" to mean password management system overlay.

2. Claims 55-58, 60-67, 69-76, 78-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich et al. (hereinafter Rich, US. Patent No. 5,918,228) in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,333).

Re claims 55, 56, 60-62: Rich disclose receiving through a web page identification information associated with a first party to identify one or more remote user applications that are available for use by the first party to access accounts of one or more other parties; authenticating the first party; selection of a remote user application; using both the identification

Art Unit: 3692

information and account identifier to verify that the first party is authorized to access the account of second party; generating a third Web page that provides a view and information that is substantially similar to view of a Web page that would be provided to the second party;. -see (Distributed File Services and System) col. 1 lines 46-50, col. 2 lines 8-22, (authentication services, and session manager) col. 4, col. 6 lines 4-67, col. 7, col. 8 lines 27-52. Rich teach a method and apparatus for enabling a web server to impersonate a user of a distributed file system to obtain secure access to supported web documents including distributed services such as data sharing, printing services, and database access, and an indication that the first party is impersonating the second party. Rich disclose a distributed file services (DFS) which provides for the ability to share information and makes files highly available through replication. Therefore, it is obvious that Web documents retrieved by the system of Rich would be substantially similar in view.-see col. 5 lines 1-8, cols. 5-6.

Rich do not specifically disclose use of an overlay application; and wherein when the third web page of the overlay application is rendered by a web browser, one or more icons are displayed. Nielsen however, teaches "At step 414, the password management system overlays a modeless (the user is free to visit

Art Unit: 3692

other windows before dismissing the dialog box) dialog box with fields into which the user would input the password and user ID under which he or she is registered to the remote site...Once the master password is entered the user may seamlessly navigate through controlled access web sites for which the password information is already stored."-see col. 5 line 40-col. 6 line 27. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rich to include password management systems overlays as taught by Nielsen in order to provide the user with a means to enter user id and password one time and be able to navigate through controlled web sites without needing to repeatedly enter passwords.

Re claim 57 & 58: Rich disclose retrieving access information that identifies the one or more remote user applications and programs that are available for use by the authenticated first party; and providing to a computing system associated with the first party, the retrieved access information for storage in an access information field of a text file associated with the session of the first party- -see cols. 1,2, 5-6. Rich do not specifically disclose use of an overlay application. Nielsen however, teaches "At step 414, the password

Art Unit: 3692

management system overlays a modeless (the user is free to visit other windows before dismissing the dialog box) dialog box with fields into which the user would input the password and user ID under which he or she is registered to the remote site...Once the master password is entered the user may seamlessly navigate through controlled access web sites for which the password information is already stored."-see col. 5 line 40-col. 6 line 27. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rich to include password management systems overlays as taught by Nielsen in order to provide the user with a means to enter user id and password one time and be able to navigate through controlled web sites without the need of repeatedly entering passwords.

Re claim 63: Rich disclose wherein one or more remote user applications comprise accessing account data.-see col. 1 lines 45-51.

Re claims 64-67, 69-72: Further a computer program product would have been necessary to perform the method of previously rejected claims 55-58, 60-63 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Art Unit: 3692

Re claims 73-76, 78-81: Further an apparatus would have been necessary to perform the method of previously rejected claims 55-58, 60-63 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

3. Claims 59, 68, 77, 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich in view of Nielsen as applied to claims 58, 67, 60 above, and further in view of Sampson et al. (hereinafter Sampson U.S. Patent No. 5,802,499).

Re claim 59: Rich and Nielsen do not specifically disclose wherein the retrieved account information specifies a right of the first party to change a parameter of the second account. Sampson however teaches varying levels of access rights granted to users in order to change customer account data-see cols. 15-16 and Fig. 4B. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rich and Nielsen to specifically include varying degrees of access rights as taught by Sampson in order to give only authorized users the right to access sensitive customer data.

Re claims 68, 77: Further a computer program product and apparatus would have been necessary to perform the method of

previously rejected claim 59 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Claim 82 has similar limitations found in claims 55 and 59 above, and therefore are rejected by the same art and rationale.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 55-82 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3692

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elda Milef whose telephone number is (571)272-8124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:30 am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571)272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/371,687

Page 10

Art Unit: 3692

Elda Milef
Examiner
Art Unit 3692



RICHARD E. CHILCOTE, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER